

Valuing Community

Applying the Value Typology to the Creative Industries

Dr Amy Burnett

VCSE Value Application
April 2026

A case study application of a Multi-Dimensional Value Typology produced as part of a British Academy Policy Innovation Fellowship with the Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

This document has been developed as part of the British Academy Policy Innovation Fellowship *Understanding the value of the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector*, set out to support insights for policy.

Please cite as: Burnett, A (2026). Valuing VCSEs—Applying a Multi-Dimensional Value Typology to understand the contribution of value in the Creative Industries Sector – DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK. Produced as part of a British Academy Policy Innovation Fellowship research with the Department for Culture, Media and Sport and related dissemination activities.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

NB: This research was supported through a British Academy Innovation Fellowship at the Department for Culture, Media & Sport. It was developed and produced according to the Fellow's hypotheses and methods. The research and findings do not represent Government views or policy.

Project Overview

This British Academy Policy Innovation Fellowship, undertaken in collaboration with the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), aims to strengthen the underlying support network of the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector by assessing the different metrics that reflect and contribute to place-based resilience. The project considers how value measures of the VCSE sector could be further understood and considered to enhance policy interventions and how they can leverage local, place-based innovations. It also draws on insights from related Local Policy Innovation Partnership (LPIP) research as a Place Fellow.

This document demonstrates how value typology produced to understand the multiple dimensions of value of the VCSE sector could be applied to the creative industries sector, and implications for policy and measurement practice. For further details and outputs form this fellowship, please see the project website: **www.valuingcommunity.co.uk**.

Executive Summary: Applying the Value Typology to Creative Industries

This document applies the nine-dimensional VCSE Value Typology developed as part of a British Academy Policy Innovation Fellowship to the cultural sector. The British Academy VCSE Value Typology was developed to help policy-makers and funders understand the full breadth of value generated by voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations — value that conventional monetary and cost-benefit analysis systematically undervalues or renders invisible. Each dimension is assessed both qualitatively — through evidence of activities and impact — and quantitatively, with estimated monetary values or scored indicators where direct monetisation is not appropriate.

The nine valuation types assessed are:

1. Monetary and cost-benefit analysis
2. Recognition, reputation and appreciative value
3. From a capitals perspective
4. Improved governance and culture
5. Community assets and ownership
6. Value chain perspectives
7. Personal value and meeting intrinsic objectives
8. Regenerative value
9. Policy influence and outcome

This document argues that the typology is also a useful framework for the creative industries, and proposes its adoption as a standard assessment framework for creative venues, producers, place-based cultural enterprises, and independent creative businesses. It provides suggested indicators for each dimension, drawing on established methodological frameworks. Organisations are encouraged to adapt these indicators to their own contexts and to use the framework as a basis for ongoing impact measurement and reporting.

For further information on these value dimensions, please refer to the value typology document produced by the author, available on the **Valuing Community** website.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Table of Contents

Executive Summary: Applying the Value Typology to Creative Industries *3*

Supporting a multi-dimensional value for the creative industries 5

Application across creative industry contexts 6

Recommendations for adoption 7

Quantifying and Qualifying Dimensions of the Typology 8

Suggested indicators 9

Suggested indicators 10

Suggested indicators 12

Suggested indicators 14

Suggested indicators 16

Integrating Sustainable Archetypes for Sustainable Innovation *25*

Six Archetypal Pathways of Ecological Citizenship 25

Consolidated Assessment Summary *26*

Appendix: Methodology and Calculation Notes *28*

A. Primary frameworks applied 28

B. Assumptions and sensitivities 30

C. Data collection recommendations for future iterations 30

Conclusion 31

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Supporting a multi-dimensional value for the creative industries

Creative organisations generate substantial economic activity — the creative industries contribute approximately £145.8 billion to UK GDP annually in Gross Value Added (in 2024). Yet much of their value is experienced as public good rather than private return, which is more than ticket sales and admission fees.

Creative organisations are often structurally undercapitalised relative to the value they create. Funders and investors who rely solely on monetary and cost-benefit analysis will consistently undervalue them. Property markets that cannot price cultural infrastructure will routinely displace it, and grassroots venues can be at risk from gentrification and redevelopment purposes. Policy-makers who measure economic contribution through GDP alone will overlook the intrinsic, regenerative, and governance value that creative organisations provide and the deeply human feeling of becoming that is bought to life through creative expression and appreciation.

The multi-dimensional value typology developed as part of a British Academy policy innovation fellowship addresses this directly. By disaggregating value across nine dimensions — only one of which is monetary — it gives creative organisations, funders, landlords, local authorities, and investors a shared language for understanding and evidencing the full scope of what is being created. Indeed, if other sectors (such as VCSEs – of which many creative industries are) this amplifies a shared and place-based value connection to support what really matters to people and find ways to articulate this in meaningful ways.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Application across creative industry contexts

The typology was designed with VCSE organisations in mind, but its dimensions translate directly and powerfully to a range of creative industry contexts:

Independent music venues and grassroots performance spaces

Monetary analysis captures ticket income and bar revenue. The typology additionally captures: the reputational value of artist development (Recognition); the human and social capital created by audience participation (Capitals perspective); the democratic function of live music as civic assembly (Governance and culture); the anchor function of the venue in local creative ecology (Community assets); and the cascading benefits to local hospitality, transport and retail (Value chain). The Music Venue Trust has begun to articulate this case and the typology provides a rigorous framework to apply it.

Creative workspace providers and artist studio complexes

Studios are rarely profitable on conventional terms, yet they underpin creative economies in cities and towns across the country. The typology captures the human capital development (artists supported through critical early career stages), the supply chain value (materials, services, and technical support purchased locally), the personal value created for artists whose work meets deep intrinsic goals, and the regenerative effect of creative clusters on neighbourhood character and value. These dimensions make the case for subsidy and protection that pure rent analysis cannot.

Place-based cultural enterprises and heritage venues

Buildings that repurpose heritage structures as creative community hubs generate value that is inherently multi-dimensional. Heritage preservation, community ownership, identity and belonging, policy influence on neighbourhood planning: these are not incidental benefits but core outputs. The typology makes them legible to funders, investors, and planning authorities in a single coherent framework.

Independent producers, labels, and creative micro-enterprises

Creative micro-enterprises — individual artists, small labels, independent producers — contribute significantly to culture without appearing in economic statistics. The typology's personal value and intrinsic objectives dimension captures the meaning-making function of creative work. The regenerative dimension captures the role of independent creative practice in sustaining the diversity that prevents monoculture in creative production. The policy influence dimension captures the role of practitioner voices in shaping arts funding and cultural policy.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Recommendations for adoption

- Arts Council England, the National Lottery Heritage Fund, and other principal funders should incorporate the full value typology into their assessment criteria, moving beyond the current primary emphasis on monetary and economic impact metrics.
- The Music Venue Trust, the Creative Industries Federation, and sector bodies should develop typology-aligned self-assessment tools enabling independent creative organisations to evidence value across all nine dimensions without specialist consultancy input.
- Local authorities preparing Cultural Strategies should require applicants for creative infrastructure grants and Asset of Community Value designations to complete a typology assessment as part of their application.
- Community Benefit Societies and cooperatives in the creative sector should use the typology to frame community share offers, demonstrating to potential investors the full scope of social return alongside financial return.
- The creative industries' contribution to the UK's industrial strategy should be evidenced through the typology, not solely through GVA and employment statistics, to ensure that policy reflects the full economic, social, cultural, and regenerative value of the sector.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Quantifying and Qualifying Dimensions of the Typology

1. Monetary and Cost-Benefit Analysis

Key question: Is this solution or intervention going to save money or lead to evidenced efficiencies?

Qualitative assessment

Monetary analysis is the default lens through which policy-makers and commissioners assess cultural organisations. For most cultural venues, it captures the most visible and immediately legible layer of value — the trading income generated by cafes, bars, studio lettings, venue hire, and ticketed events.

The monetary value of a cultural venue extends beyond its own trading income through the economic multiplier effect: visitors, tenants, and event attendees generate secondary spending in the local economy that would not otherwise occur. This multiplier effect is particularly significant in rural or post-industrial locations where the venue functions as a destination, drawing visitors from across the region.

The monetised value of cost savings to the public sector — through reduced NHS demand, avoided youth services expenditure, and economic development costs that local authorities would otherwise bear — represents a further and substantial monetary benefit.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Suggested indicators

Indicator	Example Baseline	Suggested Target / trajectory
Annual trading income	Identify and baseline all income streams (e.g., cafe, bar, studio lettings, hire, events)	Track growth trajectory and income diversification year-on-year
Public sector cost savings	Apply PSSRU unit costs to participant numbers and engagement levels	Develop independently evidenced impact reporting over time
Economic multiplier contribution	Apply NEF Local Multiplier 3 (LM3) methodology to locally sourced expenditure	Increase local sourcing policy to grow multiplier effect
Debt position	Identify current liabilities and deferred maintenance costs	Develop a clear trajectory to financial resilience
Infrastructure investment required	Assess building condition, safety compliance, and accessibility	Develop a costed maintenance and improvement plan

Evidence score (1–5)	Estimated annual value	Confidence	Archetypes
4/5	Variable — dependent on scale and location	High for direct income; medium for public sector savings	All archetypes

DRAFT

2. Recognition, Reputation and Appreciative Value

Key question: Will I be recognised for my work in partnering with this organisation?

Qualitative assessment

Cultural organisations build reputational assets through authenticity and distinctiveness: a genuine community of artists and makers, an honest programme, a commitment to the local over the generic. This is a reputational asset of considerable value in an era when audiences, funders, and partners are increasingly sceptical of culture-washing.

For funders and investors, association with a credible cultural organisation carries appreciative value — the sense that their support is backing something genuinely worth backing. For local businesses considering partnership or investment, association with a community cultural asset that demonstrably improves quality of life carries real commercial and social value.

Reputational value is often built organically through programming and community relationships, rather than through paid marketing and communications — making it both more authentic and harder to quantify.

T FOR FEEDBACK

Suggested indicators

Indicator	Example Baseline	Suggested Target / trajectory
Brand recognition and reach	Map current reach: social media following, press coverage, funder citations	Set targets for regional and national recognition through partnerships and research
Sector body memberships	Identify relevant bodies (e.g., Music Venue Trust, Creative Industries Federation)	Formalise memberships and track associated commercial and credibility benefits
Funder credibility	Map current funder relationships and pipeline	Track progress toward National Portfolio Organisation or multi-year funding status

Stakeholder and audience sentiment	Commission baseline audience and stakeholder perception survey	Annual survey to track change over time
Partnership and collaboration profile	Map current formal and informal partnerships	Develop a partnership strategy aligned to programming and values

Evidence score (1–5)	Estimated annual value	Confidence	Archetypes
i.e. 3/5	Proxy estimate: £15,000–£40,000/yr equivalent	Medium — proxies required	Awakener, Artist

DRAFT FOR FEEDBA

3. From a Capitals Perspective

Key question: Will this intervention lead to multiple benefits other than the one I normally deal with?

Qualitative assessment

The capitals framework provides a multi-asset lens on cultural value creation. Unlike monetary analysis, which collapses all value into a single financial dimension, the capitals perspective reveals the full breadth of assets being created, maintained, and enhanced.

Social capital is created through the networks, relationships, and norms of trust that develop among participants: studio tenants who collaborate and refer clients to one another; regular attendees who form friendships; event audiences who become volunteers; volunteers who become community shareholders.

Human capital is created through the skills, capabilities, and creative confidence developed by participants: technical skills in craft and production, exhibition and performance practice, governance and organisational skills developed through participation in democratic structures.

Built and infrastructure capital is embodied in the physical venue — particularly in heritage buildings — which represents community infrastructure that requires active maintenance and investment to protect. Community ownership models are a key mechanism for converting private assets into maintained community infrastructure.

Cultural capital — the accumulated artistic heritage, creative knowledge, and aesthetic sensibility held and transmitted by the organisation's community — is perhaps the most significant and least measured capital created. This includes resident artists' practice, community-held knowledge, oral history, and documentary records of place.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Suggested indicators

Indicator	Example Baseline	Suggested Target / trajectory
Social capital (networks and relationships)	Estimate number of unique participants and average number of new meaningful connections formed per year	Formalise through membership or governance structures
Human capital (skills development)	Apply HM Treasury benchmark (£27/learning hour) to estimated	Track growth with programme expansion and report annually

	skills-generating activity hours per year	
Built/infrastructure capital	Assess heritage and infrastructure value; identify annual maintenance investment required	Protect through community ownership models and asset lock structures
Natural capital	Identify any relevant designations (e.g., riverside, green infrastructure, environmental designations)	Formally recognise in planning and neighbourhood plans where appropriate
Cultural capital	Conduct qualitative audit of artistic heritage, knowledge, and creative practice held within the community	Preserve through documentation, archive projects, and participatory research

Evidence score (1–5)	Estimated annual value	Confidence	Archetypes
i.e. 5/5	£100,000–£160,000/yr (combined capital creation, indicative)	Medium–High — multi-capital methodology	Elder, Steward, Artist, Dancer

DRAFT FOR REVIEW

4. Improved Governance and Culture

Key question: Will this model lead to better and more inclusive decision-making?

Qualitative assessment

A transition from informal or single-director governance to a Community Benefit Society or Community Interest Company is not merely a legal change of structure — it is a fundamental reorientation of governance culture. Democratic governance models distribute accountability, enable participation by the wider community, and create resilience by sharing the cognitive and relational load.

Democratic governance structures are increasingly attractive to funders who are sceptical of organisations led by charismatic founders without robust accountability. Arts Council England and Power to Change both reward genuine democratic accountability in their funding criteria. Community ownership structures are the mechanism through which many cultural venues access these funding streams.

Formalising employment relationships and introducing structured performance management creates more equitable and professionally governed employer–employee relationships, reducing legal and operational risk.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Suggested indicators

Indicator	Current status	Target / trajectory
CBS registration status	Assess current governance model; identify pathway to democratic/community structure if not already in place	Target CBS or CIC registration with a clear timeline
Democratic governance	Record number of members or stakeholders with formal voting rights	One member, one vote model upon community structure registration
Employment formalisation	Audit current employment arrangements; identify informal or non-contracted roles	All staff on formal contracts with clear job descriptions and performance frameworks

SITR eligibility	Identify funding streams accessible only with community governance status (e.g., SITR, Power to Change)	Track uptake of governance-dependent funding streams annually
Funder credibility (governance)	Assess current board/member capacity and skills gaps	Annual governance training and skills development for board and members

Evidence score (1–5)	Estimated annual value	Confidence	Archetypes
i.e. 3/5	£50,000–£100,000/yr (governance-enabled value, indicative proxy)	Medium — prospective, dependent on governance transition	Steward, Leveller

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

5. Community Assets and Ownership

Key question: Does an asset managed by the community produce better results?

Qualitative assessment

The evidence base for community ownership producing better results is now substantial. Power to Change's research on community businesses consistently demonstrates higher survival rates, deeper community engagement, and more diversified income streams compared with equivalent venues under private or single-director management.

For cultural venues specifically, community ownership addresses three structural vulnerabilities: the concentration of operational and financial risk on founding individuals; the dependence on private landlords whose incentives are not aligned with community benefit; and the inability to access the full range of funding streams available only to organisations with genuine democratic accountability.

Asset of Community Value (ACV) designation provides an additional layer of protection. ACV registration creates a six-month moratorium on sale that enables a community bid to be prepared, offering crucial protection for cultural assets in areas subject to development pressure.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Suggested indicators

Indicator	Current status	Target / trajectory
CBS registration	Identify current ownership and governance structure	CBS or CIC registration as a priority — unlocks all other community ownership mechanisms
ACV designation	Assess eligibility and apply for ACV designation where the venue serves community functions	Designation achieved; review and renew on schedule
Community bond offer	Assess viability of community share offer or bond raise	Successful raise with SITR-eligible structure; track investor uptake

Community share SITR eligibility	Not available without CBS status	30% uplift in bond uptake once SITR-eligible structure confirmed
Landlord lease negotiation	Review current lease terms and security of tenure	Negotiate long-term lease providing security for programme and community investment

Evidence score (1–5)	Estimated annual value	Confidence	Archetypes
4/5	Significant long-term value: community ownership methodology (Power to Change)	High — methodology well-established	Steward, Leveller, Elder

DRAFT FOR FEEDBA

6. Value Chain Perspectives

Key question: Will this have positive benefits for my supply chain?

Qualitative assessment

The value chain lens asks how a cultural organisation generates value beyond its own boundaries — through its supply chain, its networks, and the cascading benefits it creates for connected organisations and sectors.

Upstream, cultural venues typically purchase locally wherever possible — food and drink, materials, technical services — supporting local producers and businesses and creating employment and income that would otherwise flow to larger, non-local suppliers.

Downstream, cultural venues create value for the wider creative ecosystem: artists who develop their practice in studios go on to exhibit, perform, and sell work in other venues and markets; musicians who perform at grassroots venues build audiences and confidence that support their careers; photographers and film-makers develop skills and portfolios that generate commercial income. Cultural venues are incubators for creative careers.

Creative production entities associated with cultural venues — production companies, labels, publishers — create direct supply chain value through professional services delivered to clients, positioning the venue within a professional creative services network rather than solely as a community asset.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Indicator	Current status	Target / trajectory
Local purchasing (LM3)	Identify proportion of goods and services sourced locally; estimate LM3 multiplier effect	Develop a local sourcing policy; increase locally sourced proportion annually
Artist income (downstream)	Estimate combined income generated by artists and practitioners connected to the venue from work developed there	Introduce formal tracking through annual practitioner survey or reporting
Touring circuit income	Map current relationships with promoters, booking agents, and touring networks	Develop or join a touring circuit; formalise relationships with regional promoters

Methodical Bear Productions	Identify any associated production, media, or services entities; estimate current revenue	Track client base growth and revenue annually
Regional promoter relationships	Audit current supply chain for local, ethical, and values-aligned sourcing	Develop a supplier code of practice aligned to community and environmental values

Evidence score (1–5)	Estimated annual value	Confidence	Archetypes
3/5	Variable — dependent on scale and local supply chain density	Medium — prospective elements likely	Dancer, Artist, Leveller

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

7. Personal Value and Meeting Intrinsic Objectives

Key question: Does this meet my personal goals and values?

Qualitative assessment

The personal value dimension asks whether participation in a cultural organisation meets people's intrinsic goals — their desire to contribute to society, to create, to connect, to be part of something meaningful. For creative practitioners, the entire programme of a cultural venue is predicated on the belief that creative participation and community belonging are fundamental human needs, not optional extras.

For artists and makers, a cultural venue provides a place to work that is physically and socially sustaining. The presence of other creative people, the visibility of gallery or performance spaces, the social infrastructure of shared facilities: these create the conditions in which creative work flourishes. The personal value to these individuals is not easily separated from the professional value, because for creative practitioners, the two are inseparable.

For community members who attend events, use facilities, or participate in workshops, the cultural venue meets intrinsic goals around belonging, cultural participation, and engagement with the life of their town. In rural or post-industrial communities, the availability of a genuine cultural venue — one that takes creativity seriously rather than offering it as amenity — is not guaranteed.

Indicator	Current status	Target / trajectory
Participant intrinsic value (proxy)	Apply contingent valuation proxy (£60/participant/year, conservative) to unique participant count	Commission audience willingness-to-pay research to refine estimates
Creative practitioner premium	Estimate premium above market rate for equivalent urban provision; apply to number of practitioners supported	Grows with occupancy and programme depth
Wellbeing overlap	Apply HM Treasury WELLBY methodology: estimate wellbeing uplift per participant, apply monetary value	Track via annual wellbeing survey; distinguish from intrinsic value component
Archetype participation	Map participation types across community (e.g., creators, connectors, holders of memory, animators)	Formalise through membership profiling or community research
Sense of belonging (qualitative)	Assess anecdotally through conversations with regular participants and community members	Annual wellbeing and belonging survey; report findings publicly

Evidence score (1–5)	Estimated annual value	Confidence	Archetypes
i..e 4/5	£90,000–£150,000/yr (combined proxies, indicative)	Medium — contingent valuation methods	Awakener, Elder, Artist, Leveller

DRAFT

8. Regenerative Value

Key question: Is this intervention designed so that it can benefit from positive levers and incentives, encouraging other cascading benefits?

Qualitative assessment

Regenerative value is the dimension that distinguishes a genuinely transformative community asset from one that simply provides services. It asks whether the intervention is designed to create positively reinforcing outcomes — where success in one area creates the conditions for success in others — through systems thinking and carefully considered incentive structures.

The regenerative potential of a cultural venue lies in the flywheel relationship between its multiple functions. A thriving cafe creates a welcoming public space that draws new visitors. New visitors become event audiences. Event audiences become community members. Community members become investors or volunteers. Investors provide capital for infrastructure improvements. Infrastructure improvements enable a richer programme. A richer programme attracts better-known artists. Better-known artists attract regional and national attention. Regional attention generates grant income. Grant income funds further development. Each cycle reinforces the next.

Community ownership structures are themselves regenerative mechanisms: community ownership creates incentives for members to invest in, advocate for, and use the venue in ways that reinforce each other. A community investor who attends events, brings friends, volunteers for maintenance, and participates in governance is generating value across every dimension of the typology simultaneously.

Research and documentation activities have regenerative potential in a different register: they create an evidence base that is itself a resource for advocacy, which generates policy attention, which creates funding opportunities, which enables more research.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Indicator	Current status	Target / trajectory
Community ownership flywheel	Map the reinforcing cycles present in the organisation's	Activate each reinforcing cycle through CBS/community

	model; identify where cycles are incomplete or blocked	structure registration and programme development
Touring and booking network reinforcement	Track number of events, artist relationships, and promoter connections developed per year	Set targets for events per year and associated network growth
Research-to-funding pipeline	Map current research and documentation activities; identify policy engagement pathway	Develop a clear dissemination and funding leverage strategy from research outputs
Sector network membership benefits	Identify relevant national networks (e.g., Music Venue Trust, Locality, Power to Change)	Apply for relevant memberships; track associated systemic benefits
Environmental and sustainability integration	Assess current environmental practices; identify opportunities for nature-positive value creation	Develop a sustainability action plan aligned to community values

Evidence score (1–5)	Estimated annual value	Confidence	Archetypes
i..e 3/5	Prospective — dependent on regenerative cycle activation	Lower — prospective and systemic	Dancer, Awakener, Steward

DRAFT FOR

9. Policy Influence and Outcome

Key question: Are VCSE interventions meeting or shaping policies at different scales (national, local)?

Qualitative assessment

Cultural organisations can occupy an unusual position with respect to policy influence: they are simultaneously local community assets subject to local policy (neighbourhood plans, local authority cultural strategies) and sites of practice that, through research, advocacy, and dissemination, have the potential to influence national policy on community ownership, creative economy, and place-based regeneration.

At the local level, cultural venues often contribute directly to planning designations and neighbourhood plan policies that shape the development trajectory of the areas they occupy. This is policy influence of a direct and practical kind.

At the regional level, relationships with local authorities and Arts Council area teams position cultural venues as recognised stakeholders whose programming decisions and needs inform the regional cultural funding landscape. Community governance structures strengthen this relationship by making the organisation formally legible as a community asset.

At the national level, participation in research, evaluation, and policy development activities — including British Academy research programmes, Arts Council evidence initiatives, and sector body advocacy — creates opportunities to contribute to policy debates about creative economy, community ownership, and place-based regeneration.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Indicator	Current status	Target / trajectory
Planning and neighbourhood plan engagement	Map current and proposed planning designations relevant to the venue's location and function	Engage actively in neighbourhood planning processes; pursue relevant designations
Local authority arts funding relationships	Identify current and potential local authority grant streams; assess eligibility	Develop formal relationships with local arts/culture officers; track applications and outcomes
Arts Council engagement	Map current ACE relationships and funding; identify pathway to NPO or project grant status	Submit to ACE Supporting Grassroots Music or equivalent; develop NPO application horizon

National research and policy contribution	Identify opportunities to contribute to research, evaluation, or policy consultation activities	Participate in sector body consultations, academic partnerships, and policy events
Sector framework contribution	Assess how the venue's work contributes to the case for multi-dimensional value measurement in the cultural sector	Share evidence and learning through sector publications, events, and advocacy

Evidence score (1–5)	Estimated annual value	Confidence	Archetypes
i.e. 3/5	Variable — dependent on governance, research activity, and scale	Medium — some prospective elements	Elder, Leveller, Dancer

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Integrating Sustainable Archetypes for Sustainable Innovation

Six Archetypal Pathways of Ecological Citizenship

As part of an LPIP Place Fellowship, the author has developed several archetypes for cultivating and sustaining ecological citizenship[1]. These have been integrated into the analyse framework for analysing sector and organisational value in addition to the typology. Within the definition of ecological citizenship are six archetypal pathways — inspired by Jungian archetypal analysis — understood as different roles and characteristics that people and groups can assume to steward and practise ecological citizenship in their personal and collective lives. These have key implications for policy-making, informing how socio-economic systems should support these roles and the values they sustain.

1. The Awakener Recognises nature's power, regeneration and healing. Probes ecological awakening and responsibility.	**2. The Steward** Mutual care, collective action and responsibility. Governance, networks, reciprocal relationships.	**3. The Elder** Intergenerational care, honouring the past and concern for future generations.
4. The Artist Beauty, joy, creativity and cultural expression. Creative practice as ecological citizenship.	**5. The Leveller** Justice, inclusion, access and equality. Challenges power and redistributes opportunity.	**6. The Dancer** Rhythm, cycles, seasonal awareness and flow. Aligns with natural tempos and transitions.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

[1] For more information on the LPIP Place Fellowship please visit the LPIP Hub Place Fellow webpage.

Consolidated Assessment Summary

The table below provides a template for summarising assessments across all nine dimensions of the British Academy Value Typology and using the sustainable archetypes framework. Organisations should complete this table based on their own evidence, using the indicators and scoring guidance in each dimension section above.

Dimension	Score (1–5)	Est. annual value	Confidence	Primary archetypes
1. Monetary & cost-benefit				Artist, Dancer
2. Recognition & reputation				Awakener, Artist
3. Capitals perspective				Elder, Steward, Artist
4. Governance & culture				Steward, Leveller
5. Community assets & ownership				Steward, Leveller, Elder
6. Value chain perspectives				Dancer, Artist
7. Personal & intrinsic value				Awakener, Elder, Artist
8. Regenerative value				Dancer, Awakener
9. Policy influence & outcome				Elder, Leveller, Dancer
TOTAL				

Organisations are encouraged to use this consolidated summary as a basis for reporting to funders, local authorities, and community stakeholders, and to develop their evidence base over time to strengthen scores across all dimensions.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Appendix: Methodology and Calculation Notes

This appendix sets out the methodological frameworks underlying the quantitative estimates suggested in this document. All figures are indicative and should be adapted to the specific context of each organisation. They are not audited financial statements.

A. Primary frameworks applied

A1. HM Treasury Green Book (2022) — wellbeing valuation

The Green Book supplementary guidance on social value uses the WELLBY (Wellbeing Year) methodology. A WELLBY is valued at approximately £13,500 (ONS life satisfaction estimate, updated 2024). Individual wellbeing impact is estimated on a 0–10 satisfaction scale. For community participants engaging with a cultural venue at least monthly, an average wellbeing uplift of 0.08 WELLBYs is applied as a conservative baseline (Arts Council evidence suggests 0.12–0.15 for regular cultural participation). This figure should be discounted by a participation depth factor reflecting the actual frequency of engagement across the full participant population.

A2. PSSRU Unit Costs of Health and Social Care 2023/24

NHS mental health contact unit cost: approximately £1,067 per person per year for community mental health support (PSSRU, current year edition). Applied to the estimated proportion of participants who would otherwise require NHS mental health contact, with a further discount for conservatism reflecting that preventative community activity reduces the probability of contact rather than eliminating it. Youth services costs should be estimated using the relevant local authority's comparable per-person provision cost.

A3. Social Return on Investment (SROI) methodology

SROI is calculated as total value divided by an appropriate investment denominator (e.g., property value, community bond raise, or annual grant income). Organisations should select the most appropriate denominator for their context and use this consistently across reporting periods.

A4. New Economics Foundation — Local Multiplier 3 (LM3)

The LM3 methodology measures how money circulates within a local economy through three rounds of spending. A multiplier of 1.76 is suggested for rural market towns

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

(reflecting reduced density of local supply chains compared with urban areas). Urban locations may apply multipliers of 2.0–2.8. Apply to estimated locally sourced goods and services expenditure per year.

A5. Equivalent cost methodology

Where direct monetary flows cannot be measured, an equivalent cost approach estimates what it would cost to deliver equivalent benefit through alternative means. Applicable to: adult education and skills development (HM Treasury benchmark of £27 per learning hour); cultural infrastructure provision (local authority cost per comparable venue); heritage preservation (English Heritage or Historic England conservation cost benchmarks).

A6. Capitals valuation — social capital

The ONS estimated the total value of social capital to the UK economy at approximately £4.7 trillion in 2018. Per capita, this is approximately £70,000 per person. Social capital generated by a cultural venue can be approximated by estimating the number of new meaningful social connections created per year (unique participants × average new connections per year × estimated value per connection, derived by disaggregating the ONS total to individual connection level).

A7. Contingent valuation — personal and intrinsic value

Contingent valuation (CV) estimates what individuals would be willing to pay for a good or service if required to pay. For community cultural venues, CV studies in comparable contexts (including ACE's Valuing Culture survey and Simetrica-Jacobs research for Arts Council) find a willingness to pay of £50–100 per year beyond actual expenditure. A conservative £60 per participant is suggested as a baseline, applied to the unique participant count. For creative practitioners in rural or underserved areas, a premium above market rate for equivalent provision in well-served areas may also be applied.

A8. Evidence scoring — 1 to 5 scale

Score	Meaning
5/5	Strong quantitative evidence available, methodology well-established, data actively collected.
4/5	Good evidence available, some proxy or estimation required, methodology credible.
3/5	Evidence exists but is partial, prospective, or relies on analogy with comparable organisations.
2/5	Primarily qualitative evidence; quantitative figures highly estimated.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

1/5	Dimension is relevant but evidence base is nascent; requires future data collection to substantiate.

B. Assumptions and sensitivities

Assumption	Base case (indicative)	Low case	High case
Unique participants per year	Dependent on venue scale	Smaller venues: 300–500	Larger venues: 2,000+
WELLBY uplift per participant	0.08 (conservative)	0.05	0.12–0.15 (ACE evidence)
WELLBY monetary value	£13,500 (ONS 2024)	£12,000	£15,000
% needing NHS support (avoided)	5% of participants	3%	8%
Economic multiplier	1.4× (rural default)	1.2×	1.7× (ACE urban)

C. Data collection recommendations for future iterations

The following data should be collected systematically through governance and programme reporting to strengthen the evidence base in future assessments:

- Annual participant survey: unique individuals, frequency of attendance, self-reported wellbeing change, sense of belonging, connection to other participants.
- Artist and practitioner income tracking: income generated from practice developed at the venue; performances, exhibitions, and commissions resulting from venue connections.
- Local purchasing log: record of all suppliers with postcodes, enabling LM3 calculation to be based on actual rather than estimated figures.
- Volunteer labour log: hours contributed, type of activity, equivalent professional value.

DRAFT FOR FIELD ACK

- Event attendance data: ticket sales, free event attendance, estimated audience origin (local, regional, national) for multiplier calculation.
- Policy engagement log: meetings with local authority, Arts Council, sector bodies, and others; applications submitted; policy documents cited or influenced.
- Media and reputation tracking: coverage volume and reach, social media metrics, funder citations, participant testimonials.

Conclusion

The analysis set out in this document reveals cultural organisations as sites of systems transformation, where success depends on addressing the interconnected nature of barriers and opportunities rather than tackling them in isolation. The value typology developed through this research offers a framework for recognising and measuring these diverse contributions, whilst the 'regenerative value' dimension provides a lens for understanding how cultural organisations create positively reinforcing cycles of value creation.

While there are many notable frameworks and methods for measuring value, further policy and measurement framework development is required to support the cultural sector's potential contribution to inclusive and sustainable economic development. This value typology seeks to enhance, not replace, other conceptual and methodological contributions, and suggestions to further refine and improve it are welcomed to inform further research in this area.

DRAFT FOR FEEDBACK

Contact

Dr Amy Burnett
a.burnett@mdx.ac.uk

www.valuingcommunity.co.uk

Middlesex University London

The British Academy

LPIP HUB